

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS AND LICENSING**  
**Minutes of July 7, 2004**

**Members Present**

Dr. Vermelle Johnson, Chair  
Mr. Miles Loadholt  
Ms. Cynthia Mosteller  
Ms. Deloris Oliver

**Members Absent**

Dr. Bettie Horne

**Guests present**

Dr. Margaret Amick, South University  
Mr. David AvRutich, School of the  
Building Arts  
Ms. Betty Boatwright, SC State  
Dr. Cynthia Brown, Lesley University  
Mr. Robert S. Carr, Charleston School  
of Law  
Ms. Renee Connolly, USC-Columbia  
Dr. Cheryl Cox, State Technical  
College System  
Mr. Richard Gershon, Charleston  
School of Law  
Dr. Rew Godow, Lowcountry Graduate  
Center  
Ms. Denise Hammon, Lesley University  
Mr. John Henson, Lesley University  
Ms. Karen Jones, Winthrop University  
Dr. Spike Metts, The Citadel,  
Dr. Jim Payne, SC State  
Mr. Alex Sanders, Charleston School of  
Law  
Dr. Robert Schemel, South University  
Dr. Gordon Smith, USC-Columbia  
Dr. Les Sternberg, USC-Columbia

**Staff Present**

Ms. JoAnn Biga  
Ms. Camille Brown  
Ms. De'Nitra Brown  
Ms. Julie Carullo  
Ms. Renea Eshleman  
Mr. Charlie Fitzsimmons  
Dr. Nancy Healy  
Dr. Lynn Kelley  
Dr. Tajuana Massie  
Dr. Gail Morrison  
Dr. Donald Tetreault  
Ms. Shayne Watts

Dr. Rita Teal, South Carolina State  
Dr. Aileen Trainer, USC-Columbia  
Mr. Bill Wilkes, School of the Building  
Arts  
Ms. Sammie Wright, SC State

Dr. Johnson called the meeting to order at 1:05 a.m. She thanked the staff for their hard work with the agenda items. She also thanked Dr. Festa for his support of the Committee. She then asked that everyone present introduce themselves. She also announced that the meeting was being held in accordance with the standards of the Freedom of Information Act.

## **1. Consideration of Minutes of Meeting of April 22, 2004**

Dr. Johnson requested a motion to accept the Minutes for the CAAL meeting which was held on April 22, 2004. Dr. Morrison stated that Dr. Rayburn Barton from USC-Beaufort was omitted from the list of attendees. There being no other corrections, the Minutes of April 22, 2004 were approved as circulated.

## **2. Consideration of New License**

### **a. Charleston School of Law**

Dr. Johnson asked Dr. Morrison to introduce the item. Dr. Morrison called upon Ms. Eshleman to present the agenda item. Ms. Eshleman stated that this is a follow-up on the initial licensure request by the Charleston School of Law. She stated that a team of examiners and the Commission staff visited the Charleston School of Law. The Charleston School of Law is requesting approval for courses to begin this Fall. Ms. Eshleman then called upon the representatives from the Charleston School of Law to make comments. Judge Alexander Sanders thanked the Commission for bringing the team of experts from around the country to review the Law School. He said that the Charleston School of Law has gained useful information to improve the law school from the site visit. He stated that he believes that the new law school will produce lawyers who will bring positive aspects to South Carolina and the law profession. Mr. Gershon, Dean of the Charleston Law School, stated that 940 applications have been received for the Fall 2004 class and they offered enrollment to 300 applicants. They have received commitment from 123 full-time students and 45 part-time students. He stated that the school will meet its 125 enrollment expectation. Mr. Gershon reported that the median LSAT of applicants who applied was 153. The national median is only 150.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Loadholt) and **seconded** (Mosteller), and the committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of licensure for a three-year period for the Charleston School of Law to offer a program leading to the Juris Doctor provided that 1) no “unique cost” or other special state funding be required or requested; 2) the institution discontinue advertising and enrolling students into the program if it becomes apparent that it is unable to meet its timeline to gain ABA accreditation; and 3) in the event that the school, or its officers or agents, should make an attempt to cause the school to become a part of the College of Charleston or any other public institution, the license granted to the school shall be made null and void and immediately revoked.

#### **b. Charleston School of Building Arts**

Dr. Morrison requested that Ms. Eshleman present the agenda item. Ms. Eshleman stated that this request is for approval to advertise and enroll students beginning in September 2004 for classes beginning in Fall 2005. This program’s purpose is to meet the need for more skilled construction workers in historic and modern building applications. Ms. Eshleman asked Mr. AvRutick if he had any comments about the program. Mr. AvRutick said that this will be the only program of this type in the country. He stated that France has had an established program for 600 years. The US Department of Labor has recently awarded \$2.5 million grant, which has not yet been announced officially, to support educational purposes in this field. Ms. Mosteller asked if the curriculum involves historical buildings located in Charleston. Mr. Avrutick responded that the presentation of the historical architecture will be an intergral part of the program.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Oliver) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of licensure for the Charleston School of Building Arts to advertise and enroll students for classes to begin in Fall 2005 provided that 1) no “unique cost” or other special state funding be required or requested; 2) The Charleston School of Building Arts submit to the Commission updated material to document compliance with the licensing requirements and the recommendations shown in Attachment 2 (attached); and 3) a team visit the Charleston facility in 2005 to confirm compliance with the conditions of licensing.

### **3. Consideration of License Renewal: Lesley University**

Dr. Morrison asked Ms. Eshleman to present the agenda item. Ms. Eshleman stated that Lesley University has been licensed in this state for approximately 10 years. She stated that several consultants reviewed the materials, spoke with current students, and conducted student surveys. She stated that the M.Ed. degree in Computers in Education and the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction with

specializations in 1) Creative Arts and 2) Literacy: Language, Reading, and Writing are not teacher certification programs, but teachers can use the degree for an increase in pay. The classes are held on the weekends to fit the schedules of students who usually work full-time jobs during the week. Lesley wants to work more closely with the school districts. Ms. Mosteller commented that Lesley University has a good rapport with the Commission and that the idea of working with the school district is excellent. Ms. Eshleman stated that the Commission has on-going communication with Lesley and that Lesley has to provide a yearly report to update actions of the institution. Ms. Mosteller stated that she is aware of the educational problems of school districts along the I-95 corridor and asked if there are any institutions offering programs in that area. Dr. Morrison stated that programs appealing to in-service teachers are not available through some stretches along the I-95 corridor, in traditional formats.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Oliver) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the renewal of the license for Lesley University for five years, subject to staff approval of facilities as they are developed, and grant to Lesley University authority to offer two programs leading to the M.Ed. degree in Computers in Education and the M.Ed. in Curriculum and Instruction with specializations in 1) Creative Arts and 2) Literacy: Language, Reading, and Writing.

#### **4. Consideration of Amendment to License: South University B.S., Health Care Management**

Ms. Eshleman introduced the item and stated that the proposed program will be an additional program at South University's Columbia location. She stated that this program provides a foundation for a variety of health care fields. Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Loadholt) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission an amendment to the license of South University to add the program leading to the B.S. degree in Healthcare Management to be implemented in Fall 2004.

#### **5. Consideration of New Policy on Dual Enrollment**

Dr. Johnson stated that the staff has put a substantial amount of time into developing this policy over the past years. She stated that the draft would create a statewide policy on Dual Enrollment. She asked Dr. Morrison to give a brief summary. Dr. Morrison stated the policy has been under development for two years with the Advisory Committee on Academic Programs. She stated that there has been a difference of opinion on what the policy should be, but a main concern

during development of the policy is to ensure quality as to ensure transfer. While some institutions want a policy that is more restrictive, others want it to be very permissive. The draft policy has been developed in an effort to satisfy the needs of most institutions. Dr. Johnson asked how strict the Commission will be in upholding the policy and what problems the staff foresees. Dr. Morrison stated that institutions must comply with the policy and if problems occur with issues of transfer, additional changes might need to be made. Ms. Mosteller asked if students are aware of the dual enrollment policy when they enter a dual enrollment section. Dr. Morrison noted that institutions would need to notify students. (CHE will post the policy on its website.) Dr. Morrison stated that all public institutions must comply with the policy. She said that currently 86 courses can transfer freely to all four-year public institutions from two-year public institutions. If problems occur in the transfer of dual enrollment sections of any course in the list of 86, refinement of this policy might become necessary.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Oliver) and **seconded** (Loadholt) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the policy on Dual Enrollment for implementation in Fall 2004.

## **6. Consideration of By-Laws of Lowcountry Graduate Education Center**

Dr. Johnson asked Dr. Morrison to introduce this item. Then, Dr. Morrison asked Dr. Rew Godow, Director, to comment on the Center. He stated that the Lowcountry Graduate Center is being modeled after the University Center at Greenville which has been operating for approximately 20 years. He stated that three institutions will initially be represented in the Center: The Citadel, College of Charleston, and Medical University of South Carolina. Since the Center is seeking state funding, it must be approved by the Commission. Ms. Mosteller asked if the Center will have duplication of programs. Dr. Godow stated that some programs will be duplicative in the sense that they will be offered at two or more locations.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Loadholt) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the *Lowcountry Graduate Center Bylaws*.

## **7. Consideration of Centers of Excellence**

### **a. Appropriations Request for FY 2005-06**

Dr. Morrison introduced this item and stated that the Commission is seeking additional funding for the Centers of Excellence grant program. If the additional funding is received, the Commission will be able to award one additional center. In response to Ms. Mosteller's inquiry regarding the location of an additional center, Dr. Morrison replied that a competitive process using

proposals submitted by the institutions would determine the location of a new center.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Loadholt) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission an appropriations request of \$736,217 for FY 2005-06 to fund one new Center of Excellence under the program's new *Guidelines*.

**b. *Guidelines for the Competitive Grants Program, FY 2004-05***

In her remarks introducing this item, Dr. Morrison stated there are only some minor changes in the priority areas. She stated that new language has been added for reading at the middle school and high school levels and for increasing the graduation rate. Institutions submit proposals and an external review panel evaluates the proposals. Dr. Johnson asked why all institutions are not taking advantage of this program. Dr. Healy responded that many of the institutions do not have the staff to write the proposals because writing of these grants requires considerable time. She also stated that the institutions may feel that they cannot find the match funds for the grant. Dr. Healy stated that a "Letter of Intent" is required and that only one-third of the institutions submitting Letters of Intent actually submit proposals. Dr. Johnson asked if institutions understand that this money is available. Dr. Morrison stated that either working with impaired schools may discourage institutions from applying for this grant or the institutions may not have the staff to operate the grant. Ms. Mosteller asked what the success of the Centers has been. Dr. Morrison said that the Commission could do a survey of established Centers has been. The new guidelines work with disadvantaged schools and are only a couple of years old. Prior to that time, centers reached significant number of teachers and students in their subject of expertise. Dr. Smith added that USC-Columbia created a Center of Excellence in geographic education. He stated that after three to five years the funding from the Center is over, and then the institution is responsible for 100% of the funding. So, this makes maintaining funding very difficult. He stated that he agrees with Dr. Healy that writing the proposals requires time from faculty.

Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Loadholt) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission the *Guidelines* for the Competitive Grants Program.

**c. *Competitive Grants Award for Teacher Education, FY 2003-04***

Dr. Morrison stated that four proposals were received and two proposals were funded. A review panel was appointed to review the submitted proposals. The proposed amount to be awarded for the first year for each new center is:

- 1) Francis Marion University-Center of Excellence to Prepare Teachers of

Children of Poverty-\$150,000; and

- 2) University of South Carolina-Beaufort- Center of Excellence in Collaborative Learning- \$133,567.

Dr. Morrison stated that the staff accepted the Review Panel's recommendation and endorses it to the committee. Ms. Mosteller asked if the Centers provide scholarship money to teachers. Dr. Healy stated that it depends on the focus of the center. Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Mosteller) and **seconded** (Oliver) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of awards to: 1) Francis Marion University to establish the Center of Excellence to Prepare Teachers of Children of Poverty in the amount of \$150,000 and 2) USC-Beaufort to establish the Center of Excellence in Collaborative Learning in the amount of \$133,567.

## **8. Consideration of State NCATE Partnership Program**

Dr. Johnson congratulated the three institutions whose programs are the focus of this report. She stated that NCATE evaluates the education unit of an institution's curriculum and noted that all three institution's education unit was accredited. She said an on-site review is part of that evaluation process in reviewing teacher education programs. She requested institutional representatives to make comments before the Committee might act on the programs.

### **a. USC-Columbia**

Dr. Smith asked that the Committee reconsider changing the M.Ed. in Educational Research from a "Provisional Approval" to a "Full Approval" status. Many teachers enroll in the masters program, he said, before realizing that the same courses could apply to the Ph.D. program. Thus, he said, the low graduation rate reflects the fact that this program is a feeder program for the Doctoral program. Dr. Johnson asked why the masters program has not been terminated. Dr. Smith stated that the master degree is also a "stop-out" program for students unable or unwilling to complete the doctorate. Dr. Morrison stated that the subject matter of this program is very important and that she did not think it was a "stop-out" program but a program valuable in and of itself, given its subject matter. Dr. Smith stated that the masters program is a reason why the students initially enroll at USC. Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Loadholt) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the degree designations presented in the NCATE report for USC-Columbia with the exception of changing the program leading to the M.Ed in Educational Research from a Provisional Approval to a Full Approval.

**b. USC-Upstate**

**c. Winthrop**

Dr. Johnson asked if USC-Upstate or Winthrop had any questions or concerns concerning their NCATE report. There being none, she called for a motion. Without further discussion, approval was **moved** (Oliver) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission approval of the designations presented in the NCATE report for USC-Upstate and Winthrop.

**9. Consideration of Annual Report on Compliance with the English Language Fluency in Higher Education Act, FY 2003-04**

Dr. Morrison stated that state legislation requires all public institutions of higher education to have a policy on English fluency, which allows students to submit grievances concerning the inability of instructors to be understood in spoken or written English. Each institution must report annually to the Commission the number of grievances filed by students. Ms. Mosteller asked if any complaints have ever been filed. Dr. Morrison stated that there have been 6 complaints since the legislation was implemented. Ms. Mosteller asked how the students are informed of this policy. Dr. Morrison stated that each institution is required to publish the policy in their catalog and student handbook, or in the Academic Section and/or Student Affairs Section in a combined academic/student life publication.

Without further discussion approval was **moved** (Oliver) and **seconded** (Mosteller) and the Committee **voted to commend favorably** to the Commission that this report be approved and transmitted to the appropriate chairpersons of the education committees of the General Assembly, as required by law.

**10. Consideration of Report on Program Productivity, Fall 1998-Fall 2003**

Dr. Morrison introduced the item. She stated that the program productivity standards and report offer a useful tool for institutions who are trying to monitor the products of their own programs.. She stated that if the report contains no institutional table, the institution meets all the standards. In order to be in compliance, institutions must meet one of the two standards. The study involved calculations for five years for degrees awarded and enrollment, and the institutions verified the data. Staff presented recommendations for exemption, provisional approval, full approval or termination, depending on the circumstance surrounding each program.



Dr. Morrison stated that SC State has requested deferral of action by the Commission on their portion of the Program Productivity report. Dr. Teal stated that SC State University has requested deferring decisions on the programs at SC State because the University has under going major restructuring with under new leadership. She stated that the reorganization has consolidated five undergraduate “schools” into three “colleges” and reduced twenty-one departments to fourteen. She said this situation had created difficulties for the University in responding to this report with potential program changes. Dr. Johnson asked if SC State could suggest a date by which the institution would be ready for the Committee to review the study. Dr. Teal stated that if the Committee approved the request to defer action, SC State would be ready by September 30 to respond to the current report and to indicate what new program proposals they would submit by December, 2004. Ms. Oliver asked Dr. Teal also to supply the Committee by September 30 with a list of the colleges and departments which had been changed or combined.

Dr. Smith stated that USC-Columbia is requesting that the program leading to the degree M.Ed. Program in Educational Research be approved for full approval rather than provisional approval consistent with the request made under agenda Item 8.a.

Without further discussion, approval was moved (Oliver) and seconded (Mosteller) and the Committee voted to commend favorably to the Commission that 1) action on SC State’s portion of the Program Productivity Report be deferred until September 30; 2) and that the staff-recommended program terminations, provisional approvals, program exemptions, and full approvals as presented in the attached table; be approved with one change for USC-Columbia (i.e., the M.Ed., Education Research be changed from provisional approval to full approval).

Dr. Morrison stated that the next three agenda items are informational reports which do not require any action.

## **11. Informational Follow-up Report on S.C. Research Incentive Grants Program**

Dr. Morrison stated that in 1999 and again in 2000, the General Assembly authorized a program known as the South Carolina Research Initiative Grants (SCRIG). Each of those two years this competitive grants program was funded at \$2.5 million with \$40,000 reserved for costs of administration, allowing a total of \$2.46 million per year to be distributed to eligible institutions for implementing approved research projects. She pointed out that this small investment by the State for research to junior research has led to self-supported

large investments of out-of-state (mostly federal) research dollars. Ms. Mosteller stated this appeared to be a very good investment by the State.

**12. Informational Report on Research Centers of Economic Excellence/Endowed Chairs Program, FY 2002-03 and FY 2003-04**

Dr. Morrison stated that during the 2002 legislative session, the South Carolina General Assembly passed the *South Carolina Research Centers of Economic Excellence Act*. With an annual allocation of \$30 million in lottery funds, to be matched on a dollar-for-dollar basis with non-state funds, this competitive grants program was established to provide South Carolina's three research universities with funds for endowed professorships in areas that will enhance economic opportunities for the state's citizens. The report the funded centers to date.

**13. Informational Report on SC Teaching Scholarship Grant Program, FY 2002-03**

Dr. Morrison stated that the General Assembly approved the S.C. Teaching Scholarship Grant program for teachers to return to academic work to upgrade their existing content area or add a new existing content area. The grant is set up as a reimbursement grant. She stated that the report contains statistical charts and maps that give data on recipients.

There being no further business, Dr. Johnson declared the meeting adjourned at 2:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

De'Nitra Brown